

REMARKS

Applicant will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 56, 59-62, 64 and 80

In the Final Rejection and Advisory Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 56, 59-62, 64 and 80 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe (US 6,617,784) in view of Ooi (US 5,206,746). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claim 56 is directed to a self-light emitting display device wherein "an inner angle between the light scattering body and the second surface is not less than 60°and is less than 180°."

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner contends that Abe discloses all of the elements of the claim except that the Examiner admits that Abe does not disclose an inner angle between the light scattering body and the second surface that is not less than 60°and is less than 180°, as in independent Claim 56.

Not only does Abe not disclose an inner angle between the light scattering body and the second surface that is not less than 60°and is less than 180, but Abe provides no discussion or suggestion of any angle between these two surfaces. In fact, in Fig. 1 of Abe, there is no inner angle between the light scattering body and the second surface (other than the fact that the prismatic film (1) appears to lay flat on light emitting surface (91)). Further, there is no recognition in the reference of the problems/drawbacks that lead to the specific inner angle of the claimed invention. See for example the discussion on pages 6-7 of the present application. Hence, there is no reason why one

skilled in art upon reading Abe would modify the reference with the claimed inner angle.

The Examiner, however, cites Ooi for allegedly showing this missing claimed feature and contends that Ooi discloses “a light scattering element having an inner angle between the light scattering body and the second surface is not less than 60 degrees and is less than 180 degrees.” The Examiner then concludes that it would have been obvious to combine these references to arrive at the claimed invention “in order to obtaining [sic] desired transmittance-reflection characteristics, contrast ratio and viewing angle characteristics.”

Applicant has reviewed Ooi, and it was not clear from Ooi as to why the angles therein are between 65° to 90°. There appears to be no explanation or recognition in the reference related to the problems/drawbacks or reasons provided in the present application for the claimed inner angle. At best, it appears that the angles in Ooi may relate to viewing angle. It is unclear how this relates to Abe or the claimed invention. There is no explanation in the Final Rejection or Advisory Action as to why one skilled in the art upon reading Abe would want to modify the device of Abe with the angles from Ooi. Accordingly, there would have been no motivation for one skilled in the art to modify the device of Abe with a scattering body having these angles from Ooi.

The Examiner contends that one would make this modification to obtain the “desired” transmittance-reflection characteristics, contrast ratio and viewing angle characteristics. However, there has been no showing as what the alleged “desired transmittance-reflection characteristics” and “contrast ratio” are, where they are allegedly found in Ooi and why one skilled in the art would modify or want to modify Abe (with Ooi) to allegedly achieve these results. Similarly, with regard to “viewing angle”, there has been no showing as to why one skilled in the art would modify or want to modify Abe as a result of the teachings in Ooi with regard to viewing angle and how viewing angle relates to Abe or the claimed invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection and explanation in support thereof is insufficient, there is no motivation for one skilled in the art to combine Abe and Ooi to arrive at the claimed invention, and the claims are patentable over these references.

Applicant has also amended Claim 80 to clarify the claimed invention and to further distinguish the claim from Ooi,

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 57 and 58, and 63

The Examiner also rejects Claims 57 and 58 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Ooi and further in view of Jones (US 5,920,080). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these rejected claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 63

The Examiner also rejects Claim 63 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Ooi and further in view of Shibata (US 6,147,451). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 78, 79 and 81

The Examiner also rejects Claims 78, 79 and 81 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Ooi and further in view of Duggal (US 6,777,871). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

For similar reasons as those discussed above for independent Claim 56, the rejection of independent Claim 78 is also improper, and Claim 78 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable.

Applicant has also amended Claim 81 to clarify the claimed invention and to further distinguish the claim from Ooi,

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicant is also adding new Claims 82-88 to further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. These claims are also patentable over cited references. No new matter is being added.

As a RCE is being filed herewith, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered, examined and allowed.

If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our Deposit Account
50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: *June 6, 2006*



Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 26568